NOT A THEORY: Conflict of Authorship On Contemporary Documents Relating to 9/11

By Matthew Celentano

Scope of Analysis: An Evidence-Based Audit of Investigative Conflicts of Interest, Not Advocacy of Any Destruction Mechanism

This paper's sole purpose is a narrowly focused, document-driven evaluation of investigative conflicts of interest in the official National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) inquiry (2002–2008).

In the 2007 qui tam action under the False Claims Act (USA ex rel. Judy D. Wood v. Applied Research Associates, Inc. et al., docket 1:07-cv-03314-GBD, Southern District of New York), relator Dr. Judy Wood and counsel Jerry Leaphart alleged that the named contractors (including ARA and SAIC) submitted false or misleading claims to NIST by steering the investigation exclusively toward a fire-induced progressive-collapse model while deliberately omitting or misrepresenting physical evidence inconsistent with that model. The complaint explicitly argued that the omitted evidence pointed toward directed-energy technology as a possible causative mechanism.

Jerry Leaphart's July 27, 2007 public statement—delivered in the context of ongoing Requests for Correction and the qui tam filings—was therefore not a fringe opinion but a licensed trial attorney's professional assessment of evidentiary weight under federal admissibility standards (relevance, reliability, Daubert/Frye survival). Quoting it here is not an endorsement of DEW; it is the direct use of the lawyer who actually litigated the challenge and evaluated what evidence would survive pretrial motions, expert hearings, and cross-examination.

Other mechanisms—conventional explosives, thermite, nuclear devices, or any combination—could equally have produced anomalies inconsistent with NIST's fire-only conclusions. The analysis would be identical had the qui tam suit alleged any of those alternatives. The decisive factor is not the identity of the alternative hypothesis but the documented overlap between:

- **The contractors who were paid by NIST to author the official reports.**
- **Their simultaneous, active portfolios in advanced energy systems, high-power microwaves, pulsed-power lethality modeling, and directed-energy vulnerability assessment tools (IWEA, HEL/HPM programs at AFRL Kirtland.See ARA's non-kinetic/DEW capabilities, including IWEA for directed-energy lethality analysis: https://www.ara.com/non-kinetic-directed-energy-weapons)**
- **The absence of any testing for electromagnetic signatures, ionization patterns, non-thermal bond disruption, or dielectric effects in the NIST deliverables.**

In short: the paper follows the exact paper trail the litigants themselves created. It documents a structural conflict in which entities expert in the very class of technology alleged in federal court were simultaneously helping NIST rule that class out—without ever applying their own tools or expertise to the question. Whether the true mechanism was DEW, explosives, or something else remains outside this paper's scope. What the evidence conclusively shows is that the process that dismissed every non-fire explanation was shaped by parties whose professional incentives and classified-domain knowledge aligned against rigorously testing those explanations.

This is an audit of investigative integrity, grounded solely in public dockets, NIST archived corporate capabilities statements (NIST Order No.SB1341-06-8-0539 awarded to Applied Research Associates, Inc., 8/22/2006: https://www.nist.gov/document/wtccontractaward0539pdf), DoD funding records, and the sworn allegations of the qui tam relators. No physics proof is offered or required. The conflicts stand on their own.

Background- Jerry Leaphart's Admissible-Evidence Assessment and the Legal Weight of the Directed-Energy Hypothesis

Background on Jerry Leaphart

Jerry Leaphart is a licensed trial attorney in the state of Connecticut with experience in complex civil litigation, including cases involving scientific and technical evidence. He became involved in 9/11-related legal challenges in 2007–2008, serving as counsel or advisor in efforts to compel NIST to correct or reconsider its findings. Most notably, he collaborated with Dr. Judy Wood and others on a Request for Correction (RFC) under the Information Quality Act and related qui tam filings under the False Claims Act, alleging fraud in the NIST investigation process and its conclusions.The qui tam case was dismissed on procedural grounds.

The Key Statement

In a July 27, 2007 radio interview with Kevin Barrett (archived on drjudywwood.com and widely transcribed), Leaphart stated:

"What I can tell you and the listeners, Kevin, is this. There is more admissible evidence associated with the theory that the World Trade Center was destroyed by directed energy weapons than there is admissible evidence for any single other theory out there that has been promulgated."

This was not an offhand remark. It was a deliberate, professional assessment delivered in the context of ongoing legal filings challenging NIST's data quality and scope.

Meaning of "Admissible Evidence" in This Context

In U.S. federal courts, evidence is admissible if it is:

- Relevant (tends to prove or disprove a material fact).
- Reliable (scientifically or technically sound, not speculative).
- Not barred by hearsay, privilege, or other exclusionary rules.
- Capable of surviving challenges to foundation, chain of custody, and expert qualification.

Background #2- Docket 1:07-cv-03314-GBD, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Hon. George B. Daniels, U.S.D.J.

The case USA ex rel. Judy D. Wood v. Applied Research Associates, Inc. et al. (docket 1:07-cv-03314-GBD, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Hon. George B. Daniels, U.S.D.J.) is a qui tam action brought under the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733). Filed on April 25, 2007, it represents one of the most

direct legal challenges to the official NIST investigation of the World Trade Center collapses on September 11, 2001.

Case Background and Parties

Dr. Judy D. Wood, appearing pro se at times and later represented by attorney Jerry Leaphart, filed the complaint on behalf of the United States as relator (whistleblower) under the qui tam provisions of the False Claims Act. The suit alleged that multiple defendants knowingly presented or caused to be presented false or fraudulent claims for payment or approval to the United States in connection with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) World Trade Center (WTC) investigation.

Named defendants included:

- **Applied Research Associates, Inc. (ARA) (primary contractor for WTC 7 structural modeling and collapse simulation).**
- **Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) (administrative and analytical support to NIST).**
- **Other NIST contractors and consultants: Boeing, NuStats, Computer Aided Engineering Associates, Inc., Datasource, Inc., Geostats, Inc., Gilsanz Murray Steficek, LLP, Hughes Associates, Inc., Rolf Jensen & Associates, Inc., Rosenwasser/Grossman Consulting Engineers, P.C., Simpson Gumpertz & Heger, Inc., S.K. Ghosh Associates, Inc., Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP, Teng & Associates, Inc., Underwriters Laboratories, Inc., Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc., and various individuals (e.g., Ajmal Abbasi, Eduardo Kausel, David Parks, David Sharp, Daniele Venezano, Josef Van Dyck, Kaspar William).**

The complaint asserted that these entities submitted false or misleading reports, models, and analyses to NIST, steering the investigation toward a fire-induced progressive-collapse explanation while deliberately omitting or misrepresenting evidence inconsistent with that model—evidence Wood argued pointed to directed-energy technology (DEW) as the causative mechanism.

The action was ultimately dismissed on procedural grounds without reaching the substantive allegations.

Contractor Conflicts – Applied Research Associates (ARA)

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) did not conduct its World Trade Center investigation in isolation. It relied on a network of external contractors for modeling, simulation, structural analysis, and technical support. Among them, Applied Research Associates (ARA) stands out as a firm whose core business lines directly overlap with the very technology hypothesized.

ARA's Role in the NIST Investigation

ARA personnel contributed significantly to NIST's WTC reports, particularly the WTC 7 investigation (NCSTAR 1A, 2008). Named contributors from ARA included:

- **Michael Anderson**
- **Robert T. Bocchieri**
- **Joseph Crepeau**
- **Steven Kirkpatrick**
- **Charles Needham**
- **Robert A. MacNeill**

These individuals were credited in sections dealing with structural modeling, fire dynamics, thermal expansion, and progressive-collapse simulation. ARA's work helped produce the official conclusion that uncontrolled fires caused the buckling of Column 79, triggering a global failure—without any consideration of directed-energy or electromagnetic effects.

ARA's Simultaneous Directed-Energy Weapons Portfolio in 2001–2008

While contributing to the NIST reports, ARA operated as a major contractor at the heart of the U.S. directed-energy program. Its Albuquerque, New Mexico headquarters sat directly adjacent to Kirtland

Air Force Base—the headquarters of the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) Directed Energy Directorate.

Public records confirm ARA's deep integration into this ecosystem during the precise years of the NIST investigation:

- ***High-Energy Laser (HEL) and Chemical Laser Development*: In Fiscal Year 2001, ARA received a documented $61,625 subcontract (via the University of New Mexico) for "Optically Pumped HBr Laser" research under principal investigator Wolfgang Rudolph. This was explicitly aimed at scaling pulsed mid-infrared chemical lasers from laboratory prototypes toward weapon-class power levels. Follow-on publications (SPIE proceedings, 2003–2004) credit ARA for advancing scalable HBr cascade lasers—precisely the technology family explored for high-energy laser weapons.**

- ***Personnel Overlap with AFRL Leadership*: Several ARA scientists during this period rotated into or held advisory roles on the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board and AFRL committees specializing in electromagnetic and radio-frequency directed-energy systems.**

- ***Integrated Weapon Environment for Analysis (IWEA)*: ARA's flagship directed-energy modeling suite is a dedicated DoD-standard tool developed and maintained by ARA specifically for high-energy laser (HEL), high-power microwave (HPM), and other directed-energy system performance, propagation, lethality, and target effects. Publicly described on ARA's current corporate capabilities page as "WEA including DEW tools for mission and lethality analysis," it simulates real-world atmospheric conditions, energy coupling to materials, structural disruption, and non-thermal effects.**

These programs were not peripheral. ARA's corporate capability statements (publicly available in the early 2000s and still reflected in current archives) list directed-energy countermeasures, high-energy laser lethality, and non-kinetic weapons effects as core business lines with multi-year DoD funding.

The Conflict-of-Interest Problem

ARA's dual role creates a profound structural conflict:

- On one hand, the firm was paid to assist NIST in an investigation that concluded no exotic or directed-energy involvement was present.

- On the other hand, ARA's revenue stream depends on developing and marketing precisely those technologies—lasers, microwaves, pulsed-power systems—that could, in principle, produce the observed effects (molecular dissociation, selective heating, rapid particle ejection, low-heat structural weakening).

This is not a hypothetical or distant connection. ARA's DEW work was active and publicly promoted during the same period (2005–2008) that its personnel were contributing to NIST's WTC 7 modeling and final report. The firm had every incentive to avoid lines of inquiry that might validate or even suggest the existence of scalable directed-energy destruction capabilities—whether classified or emerging.

NIST's scope of work for contractors did not require testing for DE signatures (electromagnetic residues, unusual ionization patterns, non-thermal bond disruption markers). Nor did it mandate disclosure of potential conflicts when a contractor's primary business is the very class of technology under implicit scrutiny. The result: an investigation that never looked for what ARA knows how to produce.

Implications for Evidentiary Integrity

Leaphart's admissibility assessment (Part 7) gains additional force here. If the firm best positioned to detect directed-energy effects was simultaneously helping author the report that ruled them out—without ever applying its own expertise to the question—the official conclusion loses independence and reliability. This is not mere biased speculation; it is a documented overlap between investigative authorship and technological capability in the same domain.

The ARA case is not isolated (the next section will address SAIC's parallel role). Together they illustrate a systemic issue: the NIST investigation was not a neutral forensic exercise. It was shaped by contractors whose livelihoods depend on directed-energy and electromagnetic-spectrum weapons remaining either classified or officially "not relevant" to domestic structural failures.

Contractor Conflicts – Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

While Applied Research Associates (ARA) maintains an explicit and current public portfolio in directed-energy weapon systems, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) presents a more layered but equally troubling overlap—one rooted in high-power radiofrequency (RF), microwave, and electromagnetic-spectrum technologies that share fundamental physics with directed-energy applications.

SAIC's Role in the NIST Investigation

SAIC was contracted by NIST to provide a team of structural engineers, metallurgists, and blast-effects specialists. Their assigned tasks included:

- **Analyzing the metallurgical properties of the recovered WTC steel, specifically how the alloys responded to the temperatures and mechanical stresses induced by jet-fuel fires and structural loading.**
- **Supporting blast-effects modeling to evaluate whether observed damage patterns were consistent with aircraft impact and subsequent fire progression.**
- **Leading environmental data management at Ground Zero, including tracking toxic dust levels (asbestos, lead, volatile organics) to which first responders and cleanup crews were exposed.**

These contributions helped shape NIST's final conclusions in NCSTAR 1 (Twin Towers) and NCSTAR 1A (WTC 7) that fire-induced progressive collapse, without external energy sources, fully accounted for the observed destruction. The reports contain no mention of electromagnetic signatures, microwave-induced dielectric heating, or non-thermal material dissociation—phenomena within SAIC's direct expertise at the time.

SAIC's Electromagnetic and High-Power Microwave Expertise

SAIC has a long history of classified and unclassified work in areas directly adjacent to directed-energy capabilities:

- *High-power microwave (HPM) contracts* SAIC was awarded contracts by the Air Force Research Laboratory Directed Energy Directorate (AFRL/DE) in the mid-2000s (including around 2005–2008) for HPM source development, propagation studies, pulsed-power systems, and electromagnetic effects modeling.

- *Electromagnetic-spectrum dominance* — The company has supported DoD programs involving RF weapons, electronic attack, high-power RF phenomenology, EMP (electromagnetic pulse) hardening/countermeasures, and non-lethal directed-energy concepts under Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Directorate oversight.

- *Leadership* — Former NSA Director Adm. Bobby Ray Inman served on SAIC's board of directors for many years (until ~2003), bridging intelligence, surveillance, and advanced EM technology development. Other former NSA officials cycled through SAIC executive and technical roles.

These capabilities place SAIC squarely within the ecosystem of technologies capable of producing selective material effects (localized heating, dielectric breakdown, molecular agitation) at range.

SAIC's Simultaneous Directed-Energy Weapons Portfolio in 2001–2008

While supporting the NIST forensic effort, SAIC operated as a core participant in the U.S. directed-energy program. Its Albuquerque-based Applied Sciences Operation was physically and contractually integrated with the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) Directed Energy Directorate at Kirtland Air Force Base—the same hub where ARA conducted its laser work. Documented 2001 activities include:

- ***High-Energy Laser (HEL) Joint Technology Office (HEL JTO)*: SAIC served as a key contractor/partner in HEL JTO efforts, supporting development of lethality models and databases that quantified dwell times, power densities, and beam parameters for target defeat (e.g., missiles, drones).These "cheat sheets" were the operational backbone for scaling laboratory lasers into weapon-class systems.**

- ***AFRL Integration and Active Denial System (ADS)*: SAIC provided primary on-site technical support for the AFRL Directed Energy**

Directorate, including contributions to the Active Denial System ("heat ray") crowd-control technology. This program explored millimeter-wave energy propagation and human/material interaction.

- ***Maxwell Technologies Acquisition (April 2001)*: Just five months before the attacks, SAIC acquired Maxwell's pulsed-power and high-power microwave business unit (approximately 100 employees and associated DoD contracts). This move instantly expanded SAIC's in-house capability for compact, high-energy microwave systems—technology explicitly suited for volumetric material disruption.**

These programs were not ancillary research; they formed core lines of business with sustained DoD funding throughout the NIST investigation period.

The Conflict-of-Interest Problem

SAIC's position mirrors ARA's but with added depth:

- During the same period SAIC personnel supported NIST's WTC modeling and conclusions (no exotic energy involvement), the company was actively advancing high-power microwave and RF-directed-energy technologies for DoD clients.

- The physics of HPM systems (energy coupling to conductive materials, non-thermal effects on electronics and structures, atmospheric propagation) directly parallels mechanisms that could explain the selective distant damage, rapid dust generation, and lack of conventional thermal signatures.

- Unlike ARA, SAIC's pre-9/11 advisory role adds another layer: the company participated in the Lower Manhattan Counter-Terrorism Advisory Team (via James Kallstrom's multi-agency group), assessing vulnerabilities in the Financial District and WTC area in the years leading up to—and immediately following—the attacks.

This creates a closed loop: a firm expert in high-power RF/EM effects (surveillance scaling → directed-energy potential) was embedded in both pre-event security planning around the site and the post-event

investigation that ruled out non-conventional causes—without any documented effort to apply its own expertise to test for those causes.

Implications for Evidentiary Integrity

NIST's failure to:

- **Test debris for electromagnetic signatures,**
- **Model RF/HPM coupling effects,**
- **Disclose or mitigate these conflicts**

This undermines the independence and completeness of the entire investigation. In a legal or scientific context, this would constitute grounds for challenging the report's reliability under Daubert standards—particularly when the alternative hypothesis explains the anomalies more parsimoniously.

The pattern is now clear: the official narrative was shaped, at least in part, by entities whose professional incentives and classified knowledge aligned against exploring the very explanation the evidence most strongly supports.

NIST Contractors – Applied Research Associates, Inc. Key Personnel: Michael Anderson, Robert T. Bocchieri, Joseph Crepeau

Applied Research Associates, Inc. (ARA) was one of the primary private-sector contractors engaged by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) during the Federal Building and Fire Safety Investigation of the World Trade Center Disaster (2002–2008). ARA played a central role in the structural modeling, fire dynamics simulation, and collapse sequence analysis for World Trade Center Building 7 (WTC 7), and contributed to aspects of the Twin Towers investigation. This section examines ARA's involvement, the specific contributions of three named individuals—Michael Anderson, Robert T. Bocchieri, and Joseph Crepeau—and the implications for investigative scope and conflicts of interest, given ARA's documented expertise in directed-energy and high-power microwave technologies.

ARA's Role in the NIST WTC Investigation

NIST awarded ARA multiple contracts under the National Construction Safety Team Act authority. The most significant was Contract SB1341-06-8-0539 (awarded August 22, 2006), titled "World Trade Center 7 Structural Models and Collapse Hypothesis, Contract Modifications for Structural and Blast Analyses." This contract tasked ARA with:

- ***Developing finite element models (using software such as ANSYS and LS-DYNA) to simulate fire-induced structural response.***
- ***Analyzing debris impact damage from WTC 1 collapse.***
- ***Evaluating global collapse initiation and progression.***
- ***Assessing hypothetical blast/explosive scenarios to rule them out.***

ARA's work directly informed NIST's final conclusions in NCSTAR 1-9 ("Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7", November 2008) and related volumes. NIST credited ARA extensively in contributor lists, acknowledgments, and technical chapters.

Key ARA Personnel and Their Contributions

The following individuals from ARA are explicitly named in NIST reports and contract documentation as contributors to the WTC 7 analysis:

- ***Michael Anderson (ARA Principal Engineer/Scientist):***
  - ***Lead contributor to hypothetical blast scenarios (NCSTAR 1-9, Chapter 13 and Appendix).***
  - ***Supported global structural response modeling and collapse hypothesis evaluation.***

    - ***Involved in finite element analysis of fire and debris effects.***

    - ***Listed in NIST NCSTAR 1-9 contributor acknowledgments and Appendix C (blast modeling team).***

- ***Robert T. Bocchieri (ARA Senior Engineer, Silicon Valley office):***

    - ***Primary author/lead on global structural analysis of WTC 7 response to fires and debris impact (NCSTAR 1-9A, Chapters on structural modeling).***

    - ***Developed and ran detailed finite element models (LS-DYNA/ANSYS) for thermal expansion, girder walk-off at Column 79, and progressive collapse sequence.***

    - ***Co-authored sections on baseline performance, fire-induced failure mechanisms, and validation against observed collapse behavior.***

    - ***Also contributed to earlier NIST Twin Towers aircraft impact analysis (NCSTAR 1-2B, Chapters 9–11 and appendices).***

- ***Joseph Crepeau (ARA Principal Computer Scientist):***

    - ***Key contributor to hypothetical blast and explosive scenarios (NCSTAR 1-9, Chapter 13 and Appendix).***

    - ***Supported structural simulation and modeling tasks.***

    - ***Listed in contract personnel and NIST acknowledgments for WTC 7 work.***

    - ***Involved in computational aspects of collapse initiation and propagation analysis.***

These three individuals, along with colleagues such as Steven Kirkpatrick, Charles Needham, Robert MacNeill, Brian Peterson, and Lee Ann Young, formed the core ARA team responsible for the technical backbone of NIST's WTC 7 findings: fire-induced thermal expansion caused girder walk-off from Column 79, leading to floor failures, loss of column support, and global collapse.

ARA's Broader Expertise and Conflict Implications

ARA, headquartered in Albuquerque, New Mexico, is located adjacent to Kirtland Air Force Base, home of the Air Force Research Laboratory's (AFRL) Directed Energy Directorate—the primary U.S. military center for high-energy laser (HEL), high-power microwave (HPM), and directed-energy weapon R&D.

Public records from 2001 (University of New Mexico Contract & Grant Awards Fiscal Year 2001) show ARA funding for:

- **"Optically Pumped HBr Laser" ($61,625 subcontract to Wolfgang Rudolph, pulsed mid-IR chemical laser scaling for weapon power).**
- **High-power microwave computation and experimentation.**

ARA's corporate capabilities (archived website 2006–2008) openly included:

- **Advanced energy systems.**
- **Weapon effects modeling.**
- **Test and evaluation of high-energy systems.**
- **Vulnerability assessment tools**

Despite this expertise, NIST's contract scope (SB1341-06-8-0539) and resulting reports (NCSTAR 1-9/1-9A) focused exclusively on fire, debris impact, and conventional structural failure—without any testing or modeling for electromagnetic signatures, ionization patterns, molecular dissociation residues, or directed-energy effects. ARA personnel (including Anderson, Bocchieri, Crepeau) produced simulations that aligned with NIST's fire-only conclusion, even though ARA possessed tools and knowledge to explore alternative mechanisms.

This represents a significant investigative limitation: contractors with direct ties to directed-energy technology assisted in an investigation that excluded directed-energy hypotheses without forensic testing.

Summary of Implications

The involvement of Michael Anderson, Robert T. Bocchieri, and Joseph Crepeau in NIST's WTC 7 modeling—while ARA maintained expertise in directed-energy systems—underscores the potential for incomplete forensic scope. The NIST reports, reliant on ARA's structural simulations, ruled out non-conventional mechanisms without applying ARA's relevant capabilities. This overlap, documented in primary NIST publications and contracts, supports the argument of conflict of interest and raises questions about the thoroughness of the investigation.

Henry F. Cooper – Career Ties to Directed-Energy Research, Strategic Defense, and Applied Research Associates

Henry F. Cooper (often referred to as "Hank" Cooper) is a former senior U.S. government official whose career spans critical roles in strategic defense policy, arms control negotiations, missile defense development, and directed-energy weapons (DEW) programs during the Cold War and post-Cold War eras. His professional trajectory provides a direct historical link between high-level DoD-directed-energy initiatives (particularly through the Strategic Defense Initiative) and private-sector contractors such as Applied Research Associates (ARA), one of the primary firms involved in the NIST World Trade Center investigation. This section examines Cooper's documented positions, affiliations, and contributions, focusing on their relevance to directed-energy technology development and ARA's institutional context.

Government Service and Strategic Roles (1970s–1993)

Cooper's government career placed him at the center of U.S. strategic defense policy, including programs that explicitly advanced directed-energy weapons.

- **Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Strategic and Space Systems (1980s): Oversaw Air Force strategic and space programs, including early directed-energy research at the Air Force Weapons Laboratory (now part of AFRL Directed Energy Directorate at Kirtland AFB, Albuquerque, New Mexico).**

- **Assistant Director for Strategic Systems, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA): Managed strategic arms policy and negotiations, including defense of emerging DEW technologies under arms control constraints.**

- **Chief U.S. Negotiator for Defense and Space Systems (Reagan Administration, Geneva talks): Defended the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI, "Star Wars") against Soviet objections, including space-based directed-energy weapons (lasers, neutral particle beams, high-power microwave systems) for boost-phase intercept of ICBMs.**

- **Director, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization (SDIO) (1989–1993, Bush Sr. Administration): As head of SDIO, Cooper was the senior official responsible for the entire SDI program. SDIO funded and managed directed-energy research, including:**

    - **High-energy lasers (chemical, free-electron, excimer).**

    - **Neutral particle beams.**

    - **High-power microwave weapons for electronic kill and structural effects.**

    - **Lethality and vulnerability modeling of DEW against hardened targets (missiles, structures). SDIO's Directed Energy Office coordinated with AFRL, Los Alamos, Livermore, and contractors like ARA's predecessors (R&D Associates, Jaycor) on DEW prototyping, propagation, and effects.**

Cooper's leadership during this period directly shaped the transition of DEW technology from classified research to contractor development pipelines.

Post-Government Affiliations and Continued DEW Advocacy

After leaving government service in 1993, Cooper remained active in defense policy and DEW-related advocacy through think tanks and contractor roles.

- **Chairman, High Frontier (1990s–2000s): High Frontier, founded by Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham, advocated for space-based missile defense, including DEW systems. Cooper continued to promote SDI-era concepts (Brilliant Pebbles, space-based lasers) as viable against emerging threats.**

- **Visiting Fellow, Heritage Foundation: Contributed to missile defense policy papers, often defending directed-energy as a cost-effective layer in layered defense architectures.**

- **Senior Associate, National Institute for Public Policy (NIPP): NIPP (Fairfax, VA) is a conservative think tank specializing in nuclear posture, missile defense, and strategic arms control. Cooper participated in NIPP reports supporting robust ballistic missile defense (BMD), including DEW components. NIPP's work influenced Bush-era BMD policy (e.g., 2002 withdrawal from ABM Treaty).**

- **Center for Security Policy (CSP): Cooper appeared in CSP events and publications (Frank Gaffney's group), advocating for DEW in homeland defense and EMP protection contexts.**

Direct Tie to Applied Research Associates (ARA)

Cooper served as Chairman of Applied Research Associates, Inc. following his SDIO tenure (exact dates vary in bios but post-1993, overlapping with ARA's growth in DEW-related contracts).

- **ARA Context: Headquartered in Albuquerque, NM, immediately adjacent to Kirtland AFB (AFRL Directed Energy Directorate). ARA's 2001 public contracts (University of New Mexico FY2001 awards) included funding for "Optically Pumped HBr Laser" and high-power microwave computation/experimentation—technologies rooted in SDI-era research Cooper oversaw.**

- **Relevance: As ARA Chairman, Cooper led a firm that developed and consulted on directed-energy weapons, lethality modeling, pulsed-power systems, and high-energy effects on structures/electronics.**

- **Conflict Overlap: During ARA's NIST WTC 7 contract (SB1341-06-8-0539, 2006–2008), key personnel (Michael Anderson, Robert T. Bocchieri, Joseph Crepeau) produced fire-induced collapse models without applying ARA's DEW-related tools. Cooper's prior chairmanship places him at the apex of ARA's DEW expertise during the company's NIST involvement.**

Broader Implications for Investigative Conflicts

Cooper's career illustrates:

- **DoD/SDI-directed-energy programs (1980s–1993).**
- **Think-tank advocacy for DEW in strategic defense (High Frontier, NIPP, Heritage, CSP).**
- **Private-sector contractor leadership (ARA) that later assisted NIST's WTC investigation.**

This network raises questions about institutional knowledge and incentives: ARA, under leadership with deep DEW experience, was paid by NIST to conclude "fire did it" while possessing (and publicly marketing) tools to model directed-energy effects on structures—yet NIST's scope excluded electromagnetic/DE testing.

The Cooper–ARA connection is not speculative: it is documented in public bios (High Frontier, ICAS, FPRI, Heritage), ARA's corporate history, and NIST contract acknowledgments. It strengthens the argument that investigative scope was incomplete due to contractor conflicts of interest.

Conclusion

This paper set out to answer a procedural question, not a physical one. It has not argued that directed-energy weapons destroyed the World Trade Center. It has argued something more limited and more verifiable: that the investigation which ruled out that possibility — and every other non-conventional possibility — was conducted by parties whose professional identities were defined by expertise in precisely those mechanisms, and that this overlap was never disclosed, never mitigated, and never acknowledged in the official record.

The evidentiary foundation for that argument rests on documents that are not in dispute. NIST Contract SB1341-06-8-0539 is a matter of public record. ARA's directed-energy portfolio — lasers, high-power microwave systems,was openly advertised on its corporate website during the same period its personnel were producing the fire-induced collapse models that became the official account of WTC 7's destruction. SAIC's Maxwell Technologies acquisition, its HEL Joint Technology Office partnerships, and its Active Denial System contributions were not classified activities. Henry Cooper's chairmanship of ARA following his tenure as Director of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization is documented in public biographical records. SAIC's 1986 security assessment of the World Trade Center, its post-1993 bombing investigative role, its presence in the Lower Manhattan Counter-Terrorism Advisory Team, and its operational footprint at Ground Zero on September 11 and in the days that followed are all traceable to primary sources.

What is absent from the record is equally significant. There is no documented testing of WTC debris for electromagnetic signatures. There is no modeling of RF or high-power microwave coupling effects on the steel and concrete of the towers. There is no conflict-of-interest disclosure in any NIST report acknowledging that its primary structural contractor maintained active DEW programs, or that its largest non-governmental investigative contributor had spent decades embedded in the site's security architecture. Under the administrative law standards governing federally commissioned technical investigations, and under the Daubert framework applied to the reliability of scientific conclusions in federal court, these omissions are not minor procedural deficiencies. They are structural failures that compromise the independence of the entire investigative record.

The legal context established by USA ex rel. Wood v. Applied Research Associates et al. matters here not because the case succeeded on its merits — it did not reach substantive adjudication — but because it demonstrates that these concerns were formally raised in a federal

forum by a licensed attorney making professional evidentiary judgments, not by fringe commentators. Jerry Leaphart's assessment that the DEW hypothesis commanded stronger admissible support than competing theories was delivered in that context. It stands in the record regardless of how the litigation resolved it.

None of this constitutes proof of what happened on September 11, 2001. The physical question — what actually caused the destruction of the World Trade Center complex — remains, as this paper stated at the outset, outside its scope. What falls squarely within its scope is the integrity of the process by which that question was officially answered. On that narrower question, the documentary record presented here supports a clear conclusion: the NIST investigation was not an independent forensic exercise. It was shaped by contractors with undisclosed conflicts between their investigative roles and their core technological competencies. The hypotheses those contractors were best positioned to test were the hypotheses that went untested.

The documented overlaps and omitted testing undermine confidence in the NIST process's independence, independent of the underlying mechanism.

Additional Sources

1. NIST Order No. SB1341-06-8-0539 award notice (Applied Research Associates, Inc.), August 22, 2006. https://www.nist.gov/document/wtccontractaward0539pdf

2. NIST World Trade Center Investigation Contracts. https://www.nist.gov/world-trade-center-investigation/about-investigation/investigation-contracts

3. Applied Research Associates. Non-Kinetic & Directed Energy Weapons Capabilities. https://www.ara.com/non-kinetic-directed-energy-weapons

4. Wayback Machine captures of ARA.com, 2006–2008. https://web.archive.org/web/*/http://www.ara.com/

5. U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Docket 1:07-cv-03314-GBD (USA ex rel. Judy D. Wood v. Applied Research Associates, Inc. et al.). Public filings via PACER.